

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

This response is timely filed with two (2) months of mailing of the Final Office Action from the US Patent Office. Expedited review of the amendment and response is respectfully requested in view of the Office Action made Final.

Claims 19 through 31 are currently pending.

Claim 19 has been amended to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention. Support for the amendments can be found, for example, at page 7, line 34 through page 8, line 8 and page 5, lines 31 through 36.

No new subject matter has been added.

#### **Rejection of Claims 19 through 31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 19 through 31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsuyama (US Patent No. 6,485,760, hereinafter “Matsuyama”) in view of Hunger (U.S. Patent No. 3,886,940, hereinafter “Hunger”), McPeak (US Patent No. 6,303,586, hereinafter “McPeak”), LaGrone (US Patent No. 6,407,068, hereinafter “LaGrone”), Matsutani et al. (US Patent No. 6,407,068, hereinafter “Matsutani”), Shanmyasundam et al. (US Patent No. 5,980,902, hereinafter “Shanmyasundam”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Claims 19 through 31 pertain to soft gel capsules that are prepared by a unique process. The process by which the soft gel capsule is prepared includes the steps of heating rice bran oil to about 35° C in a container, adding a filler, adding corosolic acid, stirring the mixture, and encapsulating the mixture in the soft gel capsule. The result is a soft gel capsule that *encapsulates a liquid* containing corosolic acid.

Matsuyama, the primary reference, discloses an oral composition, a hard “tablet” (See column 5, line 50 through column 6, line 20) with a “*powered herbal extract* containing corosolic acid”. (Emphasis added.) As the Office Actions of September 9, 2003, April 7, 2004 and November 16, 2004 note, Matsuyama fails to teach or suggest in any of its disclosure that

anything but a tablet that contains a “***powdered herbal extract containing Corosolic acid***” (Emphasis added).

The Office Action made Final noted that Applicant’s previous arguments were not found persuasive as the claims did not claim a unitary soft gelatin capsule.

Independent claim 19 has been amended to include the term “unitary”.

As noted above, the present invention is drawn to a ***soft gel*** capsule that ***encapsulates a liquid*** that contains corosolic acid. Matsuyama is devoid of any teaching for such an ***encapsulated liquid*** composition.

Furthermore, Matsuyama fails to provide any motivation or an expectation of success such that one having ordinary skill in the art to formulate a ***soft gel capsule that encapsulates a liquid that contains corosolic acid***.

Additionally, Matsuyama fails to teach or suggest or provide any motivation or an expectation of success to one having ordinary skill in the art to formulate a ***soft gel capsule that encapsulates a liquid that contains corosolic acid*** by a process that includes heating rice bran oil, adding filler, adding corosolic acid and then ***encapsulating*** the mixture in the ***soft gel capsule***.

Hunger, a secondary reference, fails to remedy the deficiencies of Matsuyama.

Hunger discloses that the capsule is a **two piece capsule**, not a uniform, unitary soft gelatin capsule as utilized in the present invention. Hunger specifically identifies the capsule at column 2, lines 42 through 51 as:

The wall of the bottom, closure portion of the capsule is fabricated longer than the conventional capsule half so that a portion of this wall may be folded over itself to form the external wall of appropriate length. The external wall is a continuation of the internal wall and turned in such a fashion that the rim 8 forms a smooth curve. The smooth curve avoids a sharp edge which may injure the first which is used to insert the capsule, or more importantly, the ***delicate internal tissues***. (Emphasis in original (8); emphasis added.)

Again, it must be stressed that the present invention provides a soft gel capsule that does not have any "halves". It is *unitary*. It completely encapsulates the interior mixture.

Moreover, Hunger describes a capsule that is used for insertion into sensitive areas such as the vagina. Hunger's **two piece capsule**, is prepared so that a person can shove the capsule into an orifice that has *delicate internal tissues*. The present invention is not required to be shoved into any orifice. *It is taken orally*.

Throughout Hunger, a two piece capsule is described that is quite large. Again, throughout Hunger, the capsules are to be *inserted* into a body cavity, not swallowed. This difference in size and application is specifically taught by Hunger at column 2, lines 52 through 56 where it is stated:

The capsules for intravaginal use are larger in overall size than capsules for oral administration i.e., some-what larger than the 000 oral size and more of the order of veterinary 11 or 12 capsules.

An individual would not seek to swallow a capsule that is so large as to be placed into an orifice such as the vagina, let alone a capsule that can be placed deep into the vagina (See for example, column 3, lines 6 through 7).

Additionally, Hunger's two piece capsule is actually *twin walled* over some or part of the capsule length. This is specifically stated at column 1, lines 53 through 66 which state:

Both parts are tubular in shape, hollow and open ended somewhat similarly to the conventional two piece dry-fill gelatin capsule for oral administration. The bottom, closure portion differs, however, in that it is *twin walled over some or all of its length*. That is, the wall of this part is folded over or reversed on itself externally so as to form an annular, outside side wall about one-fourth to three-fourths of the length of this closure portion as in FIGS. 1, 2 and 4 or even longer as in FIG. 3. (Emphasis added (twin walled), emphasis in original (1, 2, 4 and 3.)

Huger simply fails to teach or suggest a *unitary soft gelatin capsule*.

Hunger fails to teach or suggest, provide any motivation or an expectation of success to one having ordinary skill in the art to place a powdered dried herb into a liquid. Additionally, with the technology utilized by Hunger, a liquid would not be contained in a two-piece gelatin capsule. This is best demonstrated by the figures provided by Hunger, showing the two halves of

a two-piece gelatin capsule. This would be impossible with a liquid, as the liquid would spill out of the halves of the capsule. The present invention utilizes soft gel capsule technology, wherein a *liquid* (rice bran oil) that contains the corosolic acid is *encapsulated* by a *unitary soft gel capsule*. A soft gel capsule is simply not equivalent to a *two-piece* gelatin capsule, let alone the *twin walled* capsule described by Hunger throughout the Hunger specification.

Hunger is completely devoid of any teaching or suggestion and fails to provide any motivation or an expectation of success such that one having ordinary skill in the art would formulate a *unitary soft gel capsule that encapsulates a liquid that contains corosolic acid*.

Hunger fails to teach or suggest or provide any motivation or an expectation of success to one having ordinary skill in the art to formulate a *unitary soft gel capsule that encapsulates a liquid that contains corosolic acid* that is *suitable for oral administration*. In fact, Hunger teaches away from the present invention as the capsule disclosed by Hunger are not suitable for oral administration; they are too large for being swallowed.

Additionally, Hunger fails to teach or suggest or provide any motivation or an expectation of success to one having ordinary skill in the art to formulate a *unitary soft gel capsule that encapsulates a liquid that contains corosolic acid* by a process that includes heating rice bran oil, adding filler, adding corosolic acid and then *encapsulating* the mixture in the *soft gel capsule*.

In stark contrast, the present invention provides a *soft gel capsule* that *encapsulates a flowable liquid* that contains corosolic acid *liquefied* in rice bran oil that is suitable for oral administration.

Consequently, neither Matsuyama nor Hunger, alone or in combination, teach or suggest, provide any motivation or an expectation of success to one having ordinary skill in the art that *unitary soft gel capsule* that *encapsulates liquified corosolic acid* suitable for oral administration could be prepared by heating rice bran oil, adding a filler, adding the herb, i.e., corosolic acid, and *encapsulating* the mixture into a *soft gel capsule*.

It is well settled that it is not proper to selectively extract individual elements from a reference and then combine those selectively extracted elements to arrive at a claimed combination. Rather in considering the elements within the reference, the reference must be

considered as a whole, it being impermissible to pick and choose from a reference only so much of it as will support a given position. *In re Wesslau*, 353, F.2d 238, 147 USPQ 391 (CCPA 1965); *W.L. Gore & Associates, Inc. v. Garlock, Inc.*, 721 F.2d 1540, 220 USPQ 303 (Fed. Cir. 1983), cert. denied, 469 U.S. 851 (1984). There is a rigorous requirement that there must be some motivation, suggestion or teaching of the desirability for selecting the elements and combining those elements in the specific combination of the invention, and the motivation, suggestion or teaching must be disclosed in the prior art. *In re Kotzab*, 217 F.3d 1365, 54 USPQ2d 1308, 1316 (Fed. Cir. 2000); *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 14343, 24 USPQ2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In the absence of such motivation, suggestion or teaching, it is immaterial that some, or even all, of the elements in a specific combination of an invention are known in the prior art.

This is the case at hand. Neither Matsuyama or Hunger, alone or in combination, teach or suggest, provide any motivation or an expectation of success to one having ordinary skill in the art that ***unitary soft gel capsule*** that ***encapsulates liquified corosolic acid*** suitable for oral administration could be prepared by heating rice bran oil, adding a filler, adding the herb, i.e., corosolic acid, and ***encapsulating*** the mixture into a ***soft gel capsule***.

As clearly stated in *In re Rouffet*, 149 F.3d 1350, 1357, 47 USPQ2d 1453 (Fed. Cir. 1998):

As this court has stated, “virtually all [inventions] are combinations of old elements.” *Environmental Designs, Ltd. v. Union Oil Co.*, 713 F.2d 693, 698, 218 U.S.P.Q. (BNA) 865, 870 (Fed. Cir. 1983); see also *Richdel, Inc. v. Sunspool Corp.*, 714 F.2d 1573, 1579-80, 219 U.S.P.Q. (BNA) 8, 12 (Fed. Cir. 1983) (“Most, if not all, inventions are combinations and mostly of old elements.”). Therefore an examiner may often find every element of a claimed invention in the prior art. If identification of each claimed element in the prior art were sufficient to negate patentability, very few patents would ever issue. Furthermore, rejecting patents solely by finding prior art corollaries for the claimed elements would permit an examiner to use the claimed invention itself as a blueprint for piecing together elements in the prior art to defeat the patentability of the claimed invention. Such an approach would be “an illogical and inappropriate process by which to determine patentability.” *Sensonics, Inc. v. Aerosonic Corp.*, 81 F.3d 1566, 1570, 38 U.S.P.Q.2D (BNA) 1551, 1554 (Fed. Cir. 1996).

and:

To prevent the use of hindsight based on the invention to defeat patentability of the invention, this court requires the examiner to show a motivation to combine the citations within, the reference to create the case of obviousness. In other words, the examiner must show reasons that the skilled artisan, confronted with the same problems as the inventor and with no knowledge of the claimed invention, would select the elements from the cited reference(s) for combination in the manner claimed.

Neither Matsuyama or Hunger, alone or in combination, teach or suggest, provide any motivation or an expectation of success to one having ordinary skill in the art that a ***soft gel capsule*** that ***encapsulates liquified corosolic acid*** could be prepared by heating rice bran oil, adding a filler, adding the herb, i.e., corosolic acid, and ***encapsulating*** the mixture into a ***soft gel capsule***.

Neither Matsuyama nor Hunger provide the motivation, suggestion or teaching, and no showing has been made otherwise identifying in these references such a motivation, suggestion or teaching, for selecting elements from the cited reference to render obvious the method recited in Claims 19 through 31, and the invention cannot be used as a blueprint for identifying a suggestion or motivation.

As stated in *In re Dembiczak*, 175 F.3d 994, 999, 50 U.S.P.Q.2d (BNA) 1614 (Fed. Cir. 1999):

Our case law makes clear that the best defense against the subtle but powerful attraction of a hindsight-based obviousness analysis is rigorous application of the requirement for a showing of the teaching or motivation to combine prior art references. See, e.g., *C.R. Bard, Inc. v. M3 Sys., Inc.*, 157 F.3d 1340, 1352, 48 U.S.P.Q.2D (BNA) 1225, 1232 (Fed. Cir. 1998) (describing “teaching or suggestion or motivation [to combine]” as an “essential evidentiary component of an obviousness holding”); *In re Rouffet*, 149 F.3d 1350, 1359, 47 U.S.P.Q.2D (BNA) 1453, 1459 (Fed. Cir. 1998) (“the Board must identify specifically... the reasons one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to select the references and combine them”); *In re Fritch*, 972 F.2d 1260, 1265, 23 USP.Q.2D (BNA) 1780, 1783 (Fed. Cir. 1992) (examiner can satisfy burden of obviousness in light of combination “only by showing some objective teaching [leading to the combination]”); *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 1075, 5 U.S.P.Q.2D (BNA) 1596, 1600 (Fed. Cir. 1988) (evidence of teaching or suggestion “essential” to avoid hindsight); *Ashland Oil, Inc. v. Delta*

*Resins & Refractories, Inc.*, 776 F.2d 281, 297, 227 U.S.P.Q. (BNA) 657, 667 (Fed. Cir 1985) (district court's conclusion of obviousness was error when it "did not elucidate any factual teachings, suggestions or incentives from this prior art that showed the propriety of combination"). See also *Graham*, 383 U.S. at 18, 148 U.S.P.Q. (BNA) at 467 ("strict observance" of factual predicates to obviousness conclusion required). Combining prior art references without evidence of such a suggestion, teaching, or motivation simply takes the inventor's disclosure as a blueprint for piecing together the prior art to defeat patentability--the essence of hindsight. See, e.g., *Interconnect Planning Corp. v. Feil*, 774 F2d 1132, 1138, 227 U.S.P.Q. (BNA) 543, 547 (Fed. Cir. 1985) ("The invention must be viewed not with the blueprint drawn by the inventor, but in the state of the art that existed at the time."). In this case the Board fell into the hindsight trap.

McPeak, a tertiary reference, discloses stabilized rice bran derivatives that are provided to an individual in a variety of forms, such as by simply sprinkling the derivative on another food substance (i.e., salad, bread, cereal, etc.) being a major ingredient in a multigrain ready to eat cereal, incorporating it into a baked product (breads, muffins, waffles, etc), pasta, healthy dessert and snacks (athletic bar, healthy drink, etc.) and high fiber foods (See Column 6, lines 19 through 24).

McPeak fails to remedy the deficiencies of Matsuyama or Hunger, alone or in combination.

McPeak fails to teach or suggest, provide any motivation or an expectation of success that any type of rice bran derivative could be used to *solvate any herb, least of all corosolic acid*. McPeak is devoid of any teaching or suggestion that a rice bran derivative could be heated, a filler added with any herb, such as corosolic acid, and then the resulting *liquid* composition *encapsulated* into a *soft gel capsule*.

McPeak fails to teach or suggest, provide any motivation or an expectation of success to one having ordinary skill in the art the preparation of a *unitary soft gel capsule with any rice bran derivative*. Moreover, McPeak fails to teach or suggest, provide any motivation or an expectation of success to one having ordinary skill in the art the preparation of a soft gel capsule a herb, let alone with corosolic acid. Additionally, McPeak fails to teach or suggest, provide any motivation or an expectation of success to one having ordinary skill in the art that a *unitary soft gel capsule* containing corosolic acid suitable for oral administration could be prepared by

heating rice bran oil, adding a filler, adding a herb, i.e., corosolic acid, and *encapsulating* the liquid mixture into a *soft gel capsule*.

Consequently, none of the references, alone or in combination, teach or suggest, provide any motivation or an expectation of success to one having ordinary skill in the art that a *unitary soft gel capsule* that *encapsulates liquified corosolic acid* suitable for oral administration could be prepared by heating rice bran oil, adding a filler, adding the herb, i.e., corosolic acid, and *encapsulating* the mixture into a *soft gel capsule*.

LaGrone, a quaternary reference, fails to remedy the deficiencies of Matsuyama, Hunger and McPeak, alone or in combination.

LaGrone teaches the use of silica to prevent diabetes.

LaGrone does not teach or suggest, provide any motivation or an expectation of success to one having ordinary skill in the art to use silica in a *unitary soft gel capsule* suitable for oral administration.

LaGrone does not teach or suggest, provide any motivation or an expectation of success to one having ordinary skill in the art to use silica *in combination with corosolic acid in a unitary soft gel capsule* suitable for oral administration.

LaGrone does not teach or suggest, provide any motivation or an expectation of success to one having ordinary skill in the art to use silica *in combination with rice bran oil in a unitary soft gel capsule, let alone in a soft gel capsule* that is suitable for oral administration.

Consequently, none of the references, alone or in combination, teach or suggest, provide any motivation or an expectation of success to one having ordinary skill in the art that a *unitary soft gel capsule* that *encapsulates liquified corosolic acid* suitable for oral administration could be prepared by heating rice bran oil, adding a filler such as silica, adding the herb, i.e., corosolic acid, and *encapsulating* the mixture into a *soft gel capsule*.

Shanmyasundam fails to remedy the deficiencies of Matsuyama, Hunger, McPeak and LaGrone, alone or in combination.

Shanmyasundam discloses an extract of *Gymnema sylvestre*.



Shanmyasundam does not teach or suggest, provide any motivation or an expectation of success to one having ordinary skill in the art to use *Gymnema sylvestre* in a **unitary soft gel capsule** suitable for oral administration.

Shanmyasundam does not teach or suggest, provide any motivation or an expectation of success to one having ordinary skill in the art to use an extract of *Gymnema sylvestre* **in combination with corosolic acid in a unitary soft gel capsule** suitable for oral administration.

Shanmyasundam does not teach or suggest, provide any motivation or an expectation of success to one having ordinary skill in the art to use an extract of *Gymnema sylvestre* **in combination with rice bran oil in a unitary soft gel capsule, let alone in a soft gel capsule**, suitable for oral administration.

Consequently, none of the references, alone or in combination, teach or suggest, provide any motivation or an expectation of success to one having ordinary skill in the art that a **unitary soft gel capsule** that **encapsulates liquified corosolic acid** suitable for oral administration could be prepared by heating rice bran oil, adding a filler, adding herbs, i.e., corosolic acid and an extract of *Gymnema sylvestre*, and **encapsulating** the mixture into a **soft gel capsule**.

Matsutani fails to remedy the deficiencies of Matsuyama, Hunger, McPeak, LaGrone and Shanmyasundam, alone or in combination.

Matsutani discloses **coating a tablet** with bee's wax.

In contrast, the presently claimed subject matter incorporates the bee's wax **within a soft gel capsule**.

Matsutani does not teach or suggest nor provide any motivation or an expectation of success for the use of bee's wax **within** a unitary soft gel capsule.

Matsutani does not teach or suggest, provide any motivation or an expectation of success to one having ordinary skill in the art to use bee's wax **in combination with corosolic acid in a unitary soft gel capsule**, let alone **within** a soft gel capsule.

Matsutani does not teach or suggest, provide any motivation or an expectation of success to one having ordinary skill in the art to use bee's wax **in combination with rice bran oil in a**

***unitary soft gel capsule, let alone in a soft gel capsule***, suitable for oral administration especially where the bee's wax is ***within*** the soft gel capsule.

Consequently, none of the references, alone or in combination, teach or suggest, provide any motivation or an expectation of success to one having ordinary skill in the art that a ***unitary soft gel capsule*** that ***encapsulates liquified corosolic acid*** suitable for oral administration could be prepared by heating rice bran oil, adding a filler such as ***bee's wax***, adding the herb, i.e., corosolic acid, and ***encapsulating*** the mixture into a ***soft gel capsule***, such that the bee's wax is ***within*** the soft gel capsule.

It is well settled that it is not proper to selectively extract individual elements from a reference and then combine those selectively extracted elements to arrive at a claimed combination. Rather in considering the elements within the reference, the reference must be considered as a whole, it being impermissible to pick and choose from a reference only so much of it as will support a given position. *In re Wesslau*, 353, F.2d 238, 147 USPQ 391 (CCPA 1965); *W.L. Gore & Associates, Inc. v. Garlock, Inc.*, 721 F.2d 1540, 220 USPQ 303 (Fed. Cir. 1983), cert. denied, 469 U.S. 851 (1984). There is a rigorous requirement that there must be some motivation, suggestion or teaching of the desirability for selecting the elements and combining those elements in the specific combination of the invention, and the motivation, suggestion or teaching must be disclosed in the prior art. *In re Kotzab*, 217 F.3d 1365, 54 USPQ2d 1308, 1316 (Fed. Cir. 2000); *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 14343, 24 USPQ2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In the absence of such motivation, suggestion or teaching, it is immaterial that some, or even all, of the elements in a specific combination of an invention are known in the prior art.

This is the case at hand. None of the references, alone or in combination, teach or suggest, provide any motivation or an expectation of success to one having ordinary skill in the art that a ***unitary soft gel capsule*** that ***encapsulates liquified corosolic acid*** suitable for oral administration could be prepared by heating rice bran oil, adding a filler, adding the herb, i.e., corosolic acid, and ***encapsulating*** the mixture into a ***soft gel capsule***.

As clearly stated in *In re Rouffet*, 149 F.3d 1350, 1357, 47 USPQ2d 1453 (Fed. Cir. 1998):

As this court has stated, "virtually all [inventions] are combinations of old elements." *Environmental Designs, Ltd. v.*

*Union Oil Co.*, 713F2d 693, 698, 218 U.S.P.Q. (BNA) 865, 870 (Fed. Cir. 1983); see also *Richdel, Inc. v. Sunspool Corp.*, 714 F2d 1573, 1579-80, 219 U.S.P.Q. (BNA) 8, 12 (Fed. Cir. 1983) (“Most, if not all, inventions are combinations and mostly of old elements.”). Therefore an examiner may often find every element of a claimed invention in the prior art. If identification of each claimed element in the prior art were sufficient to negate patentability, very few patents would ever issue. Furthermore, rejecting patents solely by finding prior art corollaries for the claimed elements would permit an examiner to use the claimed invention itself as a blueprint for piecing together elements in the prior art to defeat the patentability of the claimed invention. Such an approach would be “an illogical and inappropriate process by which to determine patentability.” *Sensonics, Inc. v. Aerosonic Corp.*, 81 F.3d 1566, 1570, 38 U.S.P.Q.2D (BNA) 1551, 1554 (Fed. Cir. 1996).

and:

To prevent the use of hindsight based on the invention to defeat patentability of the invention, this court requires the examiner to show a motivation to combine the citations within the reference to create the case of obviousness. In other words, the examiner must show reasons that the skilled artisan, confronted with the same problems as the inventor and with no knowledge of the claimed invention, would select the elements from the cited reference(s) for combination in the manner claimed.

As stated in *In re Dembiczak*, 175 F.3d 994, 999, 50 U.S.P.Q.2d (BNA) 1614 (Fed. Cir. 1999):

Our case law makes clear that the best defense against the subtle but powerful attraction of a hindsight-based obviousness analysis is rigorous application of the requirement for a showing of the teaching or motivation to combine prior art references. See, e.g., *C.R. Bard, Inc. v. M3 Sys., Inc.*, 157 F.3d 1340, 1352, 48 U.S.P.Q.2D (BNA) 1225, 1232 (Fed. Cir. 1998) (describing “teaching or suggestion or motivation [to combine]” as an “essential evidentiary component of an obviousness holding”); *In re Rouffet*, 149 F.3d 1350, 1359, 47 U.S.P.Q.2D (BNA) 1453, 1459 (Fed. Cir. 1998) (“the Board must identify specifically... the reasons one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to select the references and combine them”); *In re Fritch*, 972 F2d 1260, 1265, 23 USP.Q.2D (BNA) 1780, 1783 (Fed. Cir. 1992) (examiner can satisfy burden of obviousness in light of combination “only by showing some objective teaching [leading to the combination]”); *In re Fine*, 837F.2d 1071, 1075, 5 U.S.P.Q.2D

(BNA) 1596, 1600 (Fed. Cir. 1988) (evidence of teaching or suggestion “essential” to avoid hindsight); *Ashland Oil, Inc. v. Delta Resins & Refractories, Inc.*, 776 F.2d 281, 297, 227 U.S.P.Q. (BNA) 657, 667 (Fed. Cir. 1985) (district court's conclusion of obviousness was error when it “did not elucidate any factual teachings, suggestions or incentives from this prior art that showed the propriety of combination”). See also *Graham*, 383 U.S. at 18, 148 U.S.P.Q. (BNA) at 467 (“strict observance” of factual predicates to obviousness conclusion required). Combining prior art references without evidence of such a suggestion, teaching, or motivation simply takes the inventor's disclosure as a blueprint for piecing together the prior art to defeat patentability--the essence of hindsight. See, e.g., *Interconnect Planning Corp. v. Feil*, 774 F.2d 1132, 1138, 227 U.S.P.Q. (BNA) 543, 547 (Fed. Cir. 1985) (“The invention must be viewed not with the blueprint drawn by the inventor, but in the state of the art that existed at the time.”). In this case the Board fell into the hindsight trap.

None of the references, alone or in combination, teach or suggest, provide any motivation or an expectation of success to one having ordinary skill in the art that a ***unitary soft gel capsule*** that ***encapsulates liquified corosolic acid*** suitable for oral administration could be prepared by heating rice bran oil, adding a filler, adding the herb, i.e., corosolic acid, and ***encapsulating*** the mixture into a ***soft gel capsule***.

It is believed that all of the issues raised in the Office Action have been addressed herein. Should the Examiner maintain the rejection of any of the pending claims, it is respectfully requested that it be pointed out with particularity how the cited reference meets each and every term of each claim with respect to which rejection is maintained, and if the rejection is based on obviousness, identification of the specific motivation, suggestion or teaching in the reference for combining elements in the specific combination off the invention.

In the event the amendments and arguments are not deemed to place the application in condition for allowance, Applicant respectfully requests that the amendments be made of record so that the issues can be crystallized for purposes of Appeal.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

**Conclusion**


This application now stands in allowable form and reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested. If a telephonic consultation would help to expedite the processing of the application, the Examiner is urged to contact the attorney below at the Examiner's convenience.

No fee is deemed necessary. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiencies or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 04-1420.

Respectfully submitted,

DORSEY & WHITNEY LLP  
Customer Number 25763

Date: December 16, 2005

By:   
\_\_\_\_\_  
Scott D. Rothenberger  
Reg. No. 41,277  
Intellectual Property Department  
Suite 1500, 50 South Sixth Street  
Minneapolis, MN 55402-1498  
(612) 340-8819